

Mr. Stephen S. Rosenfeld
The Washington Post
115 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Rosenfeld,

Because I believe that you and Ms. Greenfield are among the best-informed in Washington and because I believe that the person who wrote your today's editorial, "Is the FBI Going Downhill?" ^{is honest} I am astounded that you are not aware that all those you regard as current abuses of the FBI have been its practise for years.

(I hope you will once again excuse my typing, which can't be any better. And, I'm almost 84 and ~~had~~ had congestive ^{heart} ~~heart~~-failure twice in the past year.)

Each and every one of those lab failings was commonplace in my experiences with it and with its work going back more than 30 years. Add perjury, too. But that was ~~not~~ restricted to the lab. They were all capable of that. To prove it and in an unsuccessful effort to end it I placed myself under oath to allege it rather than having my lawyer state it in a motion only. The FBI's ~~reply~~ reply three pages of which I enclose was accepted by federal district court in Washington as a defense of proven perjury before it! So, why should the FBI not regard itself as immune in its practise of those abuses? ^(It said that in a new more and its investigation than any in working in the FBI.) about the JFK assassination. My connections with the FBI were over its work in the political assassinations. In my FOIA lawsuits I deposed four lab agents. They proved Sanford Ungar's point in his book on the FBI in which he stated that the lab agents were carefully train^d to confound ^{cor}s examination. It was quite a spectacle! Each was trained in accord with what he could get away with and they were good at it. One even admitted much of what this editorial says and nobody paid any attention. Not the judge and not the papers.

I doubt if many, if any, in the media have thought of the JFK assassination as I do. I believe that regardless of the intent of the assassin or ~~assassin~~ assassins, the assassination of a president is in effect a coup d'etat. If the media, the Post in particular, had regarded it that way rather than ~~seemingly~~ seeming to believe that the media should support what was clearly the official mythology, I think much of our history/since then would have been different.

I believe, based on my experiences when I could travel and speak to colleges and from innumerable calls and more than 20,000 letters from strangers, is that the media and the government attitude toward the assassination is one of the two greatest causes of disenchantment with both.

George Lardner's has been by far the best reporting on the assassination

but it was entirely inadequate. He knew how far the Post would go and he went no further. But I do recall that once when in one of those FOIA cases I got proof of lab hanky-panky and phoned George at home he did the story and then had to fight with his editor to get it printed. *It was his day off.*

I think George will tell you that I never gave him a bum steer or sought any personal attention. I do not now. I'm trying to inform you, in the hope that it can make a difference. And that one difference can be a better FBI.

The FBI deliberately deceived the Warren Commission which was, mostly, happy to be deceived that way. Senator Russell, with whom I later had a relationship, was an exception but he devoted little time to the Commission. He did not agree with its most basic conclusion. Neither did John Sherman Cooper. The Commission came both into believing that a rephrasing of the conclusion they would not agree to changed it but it did not. It was merely a rephrasing of the same thing. Made possible by the deliberate FBI lab dishonesty that would have been apparent if the media had not so totally accepted what it should not have, proceedings entirely in secret when had Oswald not been killed, it would all have been public-and telecast. I think the extent of this, by the lab, will surprise you. And it relates to the most basic of the alleged evidence.

Please remember that I am alone in restricting my books to the official evidence. I assure you that critical as they are, going back to my first, of 1965, I have yet to get a call or a letter from any of those of whom I was so critical complaining of unfairness or inaccuracy.

And example of the media prejudice on this is that the Post, and with it all the major papers, refused to review any of my nine books. Including the ^{WV} ~~new~~ more recent ones that were published commercially.

So the Post not only did not do the reporting it should have done, it kept its readers from knowing about other sources of what the Post did not report to them. (But its record is better than that of the NY Times at that.)

Evidence in the JFK assassination was destroyed by the lab. No question! I stated it under oath and the FBI was silent. In fact, it once provided fifth-grade hearsay to explain why it did not give me what it should have in a lawsuit. It said it believed that evidence was destroyed,

There is little question about it, the FBI framed two men as assassins when it had the evidence they were not and could not have been. I can say this because I have their evidence.

I could go on and on but I do not think you want to take that time. However, if anyone at the Post wants me to, I'll take the time to give chapter and verse on what I say.

I believe the Post, along with all the media, ought give thought to what has happened because of what it did not report that it could and should have reported.

To what it did to the country and to popular attitude toward the media.

To what will be believed about the media, the Post in particular, in the future as more and more of this tragic history gets attention.

Honest as Mrs. Graham's autobiography selections in the Post were I think she ^{may} want to think about how she as the publisher will be regarded in history over the Post's failings in assassination reporting.

With all the faults you attribute to the FBI lab its record in the JFK assassination, do you believe there would be those faults today had they been reported in connection with the assassination?

When they have been the practice for more than 30 years, how much less than their being permanent, the word in your last sentence, have they been?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg